



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,147	07/16/2003	Robert Ian Gresham	18065	1214
26794	7590	11/16/2006	EXAMINER	
TYCO TECHNOLOGY RESOURCES 4550 NEW LINDEN HILL ROAD, SUITE 140 WILMINGTON, DE 19808-2952			CAVALLARI, DANIEL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2836	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/621,147	GRESHAM, ROBERT IAN
	Examiner Daniel J. Cavallari	Art Unit 2836

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 August 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The examiner acknowledges a submission of the amendment filed on 8/24/2006. The amendments to the figures, specification, claims 1-5, 7 & 8 and cancellation of claims 6 and 11 are accepted.

The previously made objection to the drawings and claims is withdrawn in view of the amendments.

The previously made 112 first paragraph rejection of claims 1-8 and 112 second paragraph rejection of claim 11 are withdrawn in view of the amendments.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the particular base configuration of the third transistors) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The examiner points out that the limitations which are in the applicants arguments do not appear in the presently amended claims, particularly "...at its base to a base of the corresponding third transistor..." does not appear in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 4, & 6- 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miki et al. (US 5,396,131).

In regard to Claims 1 & 9

Miki et al. (hereinafter referred to as Miki)

- A first circuit portion (401) corresponding to a first input port, read on by VA1 & VA2 (Channel 1) (See Figure 10).
- A second circuit portion (402) corresponding to a second input port, read on by the input to transistor gates 301' & 302' (Channel 2) (See Figure 10).
- An output port, read on by I₁₀ & I₂₀ (See Figure 10).
- Wherein each of the first and second circuit portions includes at least one first transistor, read on by a first differential amplifier (301 and 301') providing a portion of an isolation channel, at least a second transistor, read on by a second differential amplifier (303 and 303') providing a portion of a transmit channel, and two third transistors for providing a control bias which selects an input, read on by 305 & 306 and its equivalent in circuit 402 (See Figure 10) coupled to each other (via lines I₁₀ & I₂₀) and to control voltage source (309).

In regard to Claim 3

- The third transistors (305, 306, and corresponding transistors for circuit 402) of the first and second portions provides a control bias for selecting which of the first and second input ports are coupled to the output port (I_{10} & I_{20}).

In regard to Claim 4, 7, & 8

- The at least one first transistor (301) comprises two transistors (301 & 302) having emitters coupled to each other and coupled to a collector of the third transistor (305) (See Figure 10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miki et al. and Limberg (US 3,798,376).

Incorporating all arguments above of the switching device taught by Miki, Miki further teaches the use of solid state devices (See Figure 10), but fails to explicitly teach the circuit formed on an integrated circuit.

Limberg teaches solid state components integrated on an integrated circuit (See Column 2, Lines 13-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the switching circuit of Miki into an integrated circuit as taught by Limberg. The motivation would have been the reduced size and weight, increased reliability and economic advantages offered by integrated circuits as opposed to discrete components (See Limberg, column 2, Lines 13-26).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miki et al. and Hester (US 4,460,873).

Incorporating all arguments above of the switching device taught by Miki, Miki teaches amplifiers comprising two transistors but fails to teach them comprising three transistors. Hester teaches the use of amplifiers comprising three transistors in which a Darlington pair (as taught by Miki et al.) is incorporated with two other transistors (96 & 98) in which to create a high gain operational amplifier (See Hester, Figure & Column 4, Lines 25-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the high gain operational amplifier as taught by Hester with the switch circuit of Miki et al. The motivation would have been to provide a more powerful amplifier capable of outputting better gains.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Cavallari whose telephone number is (571)272-8541. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus can be reached on (571)272-2800 x36. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel Cavallari

October 30, 2006



BRIAN SIRCUS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800